

Amendment(s) to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of this amendment, which amends claims 35 and 49, and cancels claims 53-56, claims 35-53 will be pending. In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5); claims 49 and 56 were objected to; and claims 35-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kelly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,205, hereinafter "Kelly").

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5) because they did not include certain reference characters mentioned in the description. In response, applicants have amended Fig. 3 to include the reference character 300.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 49 and 56 were objected to. Applicants have amended claim 49 as suggested. Claim 56 has been canceled and thus the rejection is moot.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kelly. Applicants submit that Kelly does not disclose or suggest every element of claim 35, as amended. Claim 35 recites:

a documentation tracker configured to record host operation addresses at appointed points of the host operation sequences being executed, wherein, for each host operation address, operations required to calculate a corresponding foreign state for the host operation address are added to documentation; and
a recovery mechanism configured to select a documentation in the set of documentations using a host operation address corresponding to the selected documentation, wherein the recovery mechanism is configured to perform the operations saved in the documentation to calculate the corresponding foreign state for the host operation address and to continue foreign codes execution in case of the exception arisen during the execution of the corresponding optimized host codes.

Kelly discloses transferring the contents of all working registers to official target registers and allowing an operation called a rollback to quickly transfer the content of all official target registers back to their working register equivalents. A gated store buffer stores working memory state changes on an uncommitted side of a hardware gate and official memory state changes on a committed side of the hardware gate. *See Kelly*, col. 12, lines 41-52. If an exception occurs, the original state in the target registers at the last update (or commitment) may be recalled to the working registers and uncommitted memory stores in the gated store buffer are dumped. *See Kelly*, col. 12, line 66 - col. 13, line 5.

In contrast, claim 35 discloses adding operations required to calculate a corresponding foreign state for the host operation address are added to documentation. When an exception occurs, the operations are executed for a corresponding host operation address to recover a foreign state and to continue foreign codes execution. In contrast, Kelly discloses rolling back contents of official target registers back to the working registers' equivalents and dumping the uncommitted memory stores in the gated store buffer. Kelly does not need to use documentation to perform a set of operations because Kelly rolls back its target registers to recover state. The recording of the operations and host addresses is not stored in documentation and operations are not executed to recover a foreign state.

The rejection states that it is inherent that Kelly uses documentation to allow code to continue. However, applicants it is not inherent in Kelly to store a set of documentations each including operations for host operation addresses, and then to determine a documentation where operations are executed to recover foreign state to continue foreign codes execution because Kelly rolls back its target registers to recover state. Applicants request that the Examiner show where in Kelly documentation as claimed is suggested.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 35.. Claims 36-48 depend from claim 35 and thus derive patentability at least therefrom.

The cited references also do not disclose or suggest every element of claim 49, as amended. For example, the cited references do not disclose or suggest "using one of the documentations in the set of documentations corresponding to executed optimized binary translated code when an exception arises during its execution to recover a foreign state

corresponding to a recovery point for the exception, wherein the foreign state is recovered by executing the operations for the one of the documentations." Claims 50-52 depend from claim 49 and are thus patentable over the cited references.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/5/05


Brian N. Young
Reg. No. 48,602

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
BNY:sfs
60541908 v1

ANNOTATED SHEET

Foreign Virtual Space 116

Host Virtual Space 118




FIGURE 2




FIGURE 3